

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL. IV

NEW YORK, MAY 27, 1911

No. 29

A prominent publishing house, when asked recently about the preparation of a book embodying the new theories of classical teaching, replied that there was no demand for such a book outside of New York State and very little there. It is a far cry from New York to New Mexico, but certainly a pamphlet by Dr. E. D. McQueen Gray, President of the University of New Mexico, to which I alluded last week, indicates a very serious dissatisfaction with present conditions and text-books. He says:

This unnatural and unpractical method is adopted and framed, as it appears to me, for the sole reason that Latin, in the secondary schools, is not studied primarily—if at all—for the sake of the advantages which I have maintained on its behalf, but simply as a preparation for further study. It is not treated as an acquisition in itself, but merely as a stepping-stone to one. Latin, as a real language, still lies beyond the ken of the high school pupil. He is expected to go to college to acquire it. The requirements of the college dominate and control the secondary course in Latin, as they do in other subjects, to the detriment of our national education.

Such a system seems to me nothing short of iniquitous. If the assertions of the Latinists as to the benefits derived from the study of Latin are true, why do we not teach Latin with a view to the acquisition of these benefits?

If something is not done and that quickly, the result is inevitable that Latin will be removed from our system of education. This Dr. Gray thinks would be a most serious calamity. His remedy is to teach Latin as a real language and to emphasize throughout the fact that Latin is a composite part of the English tongue. Much of Dr. Gray's indictment applies to college teaching as well and it is really amusing to suppose that a youth is expected to go to college to acquire the real Latin when he does not get it in the High School. But that the High School is the place to begin is not a disputable proposition.

The question of the proper method to pursue is not an easy one. To some of us it seems that the oral method, if properly handled, affords the best prospect of attaining the success we all desire. The most of those who impugn this method, not having tried it, and some of those who impugn it after having mishandled it, occupy merely the 'stand-patter's' position with an entirely hopeless outlook into the future. The adherents of the new method are optimists. Pessimism would be a moderate term

to apply to the views of most of the standpatters. But Dr. Gray has an entirely different method to propose. It is, in brief, the parallel column method. The Latin, in the choice of which he is extremely catholic, is to be printed on one side of the page and the English translation is to parallel it. The words used are to be collected in vocabularies after each lesson and *learned by heart* ("the proper place for vocabulary is in the head of the boy", says Dr. Gray) and used in rendering Latin into English and English into Latin equally from the beginning. Paradigms and syntax should be taught as attendant circumstances, so to speak, the main aim of the student's work being the learning of Latin. "In short", as he says, "Latin should be taught just as any other language".

One of the chief merits that Dr. Gray claims for his method is that the student, by having the correct rendering of the Latin always in view, is prevented from making mistakes and using unsuitable modes of speech and he enunciates this golden text of pedagogy, "One of the main objects of teaching is to prevent pupils from making mistakes". The most interesting part of this system is the committing to memory of large sections of the Latin read and his choice of material is not the regular secondary Latin authors but easy passages from any Latin author, including the Fathers and the Schoolmen, the Vulgate, Marcus Aurelius, Thomas More, Bacon, Luther, Milton and historical documents.

Many will cast this program aside at once as too fantastic to be seriously considered but, in the hands of a good teacher, who can say that it would not be eminently successful? The aim of the most of our beginners' books is to minimize the amount of thinking that a student is compelled to do and our common teaching editions translate all the difficult passages and many that are not difficult. The main points of Dr. Gray's method are after all constant handling of what is learned day by day, constant translation from English to Latin and Latin to English with closed books, constant memorizing of word and phrase meanings and of whole passages and *loci classici*. If all this work is really done, how can the pupil fail to learn? and not merely to learn but to recognize the fact? Such a method demands a teacher, but so does the oral method and in the vital points the two methods are akin. G. L.

AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIP¹

I.

To the many general causes of educational unsettlement and confusion in this "age of transition", the United States adds one peculiar to itself. Normally, the higher educational system of a great country should send its roots deep down into the national tradition, and its organs should be nicely adjusted to one another and to the functions of the national life. But the American college is an accidental development of colonial copies of the English college, and the superposed American university, even when not a direct imitation of the German university, is manned chiefly by professors "made in Germany". For the disadvantages of these anomalies, there is some compensation in a certain breadth, flexibility, and open-mindedness that characterize the better type of American scholar. But the disadvantages are nevertheless very real and not to be blinked. They may be summed up in the word maladjustment, manifesting itself externally in the imperfect co-ordination of secondary, collegiate, and university instruction, and spiritually in the divorce of our scholarship and our science from culture. There are, of course, many other causes for this—specialism, commercialism, democracy. But the chief cause, perhaps, is the fact that our professional scholarship has been in the past an importation, not an indigenous growth—an importation not from England, the home of our literature; not from France, whose qualities would best correct the excesses of professionalism and the heavy Teutonic strain in ourselves, but from Germany, whose culture, as Goethe, Heine, Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche have told their compatriots, is a sporadic, feebly-rooted flower, choked by a weedy growth of over-specialized erudition.

There is no remedy for this state of affairs in doctrinaire and revolutionary reform of our educational machinery, nor in those facile denunciations of pedantry with which lively writers can always win the applause of a gallery that has been habituated by professors of the new pedagogy to apply that purely relative term to every form of exact and minute scholarship. The fault is not with the seminar, the doctoral dissertation, or the final examination. These are convenient and flexible instrumentalities which the university professor is already free to use for the realization of any idea to which he can win his students. It is the ideals and aims themselves that need to be liberalized, not revolutionized. That is necessarily a slow process, the

first step in which must be a clearer self-consciousness on the part of American scholars and a fuller appreciation of the problem which the development of the American university has created for them. Our task is to re-define and so far as may be harmonize the aims of culture and scholarship without undue concessions to the gushing dilettante, and to emancipate ourselves from slavish subservience to German influence without losing the lessons or forgetting the debt of gratitude that we owe to Germany.

II.

In practice, the beginning of such a reaction shows itself in the increasing proportion of American students who now pursue their graduate studies at home instead of going to Germany. Our pupils recognize that the much exaggerated and rapidly lessening scientific superiority of the German universities is more than outweighed by the possibilities of unity and continuity of culture, uninterrupted contact with the national life and education, and the more intelligent and sympathetic personal guidance which the better American universities provide. They see that our degrees are somewhat harder to win, and infer that they may be quite as well worth the winning. They are right, and we should henceforth reserve travelling fellowships for holders of the American doctorate who will visit the German universities as intelligent observers and critics, and not abandon themselves in helpless, open-mouthed plasticity to be moulded into patterns of second-rate Germans. Men who go directly from the inadequate preparation of the ordinary minor college to the great European universities not only waste a year or two in fumbling endeavors to adjust themselves to alien conditions, but convey and receive totally false impressions about American and European scholarship. The superiority of the foreign university rests almost wholly on the severer discipline of the German gymnasium and the great English public schools. The American university professor, if competent for his task, is aware of this difference, makes allowance for it, and in the end brings a fair proportion of his men up to the European standard even in the technique of scholarship. There is no provision for this work in the European universities. The visiting American student, if exceptionally able and ambitious, may be stimulated to remedy his deficiencies unaided. In a large proportion of cases he copies out copiously and slavishly lecture notes not adapted to his needs, fancying that he is storing up treasures of erudition undreamt of in America, and leaving on the mind of his German or Oxford professor a conviction, which courtesy vainly endeavors to disguise, that Americans lack the very notion of sincere and serious scholarship. At the end of three or four years he returns, completely out of touch with

¹ As we set about making up the last number of the current volume of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, The Nation for May 11, containing a most important paper by Professor Shorey, on American Scholarship, arrived. This brilliant paper contains so much of interest and value to students of the Classics, that we gladly reproduce it here. The paper is written with fullest knowledge of the criticisms of the teaching and study of the Classics made in this country both by those within and those without the classical ranks. C. K.

American life and American education, to teach American boys. If a Rhodes scholar, he has gained an English intonation, some polish of manner it may be, and possibly an enlarged and more discriminating English vocabulary. But he is no nearer to an earned doctor's degree and professional mastery of his subject than one year at a first-class American university would have brought him. If Germany was his choice, he may have received the degree which Germany bestows somewhat lightly for the encouragement of the alien, and he has learned a foreign language. But he has paid a heavy price for his German in three years' discontinuance of the habit of reading English, and in the Teutonization of his English style. He has steeped himself, not so much in his subject, as in the German terminology and systematic *Wissenschaft* of his subject, with the result that either he will remain for life the prisoner of the system and the terminology, or, as sometimes happens, in a mood of revolt and reaction, he stops his subscription to the *Selten Erscheinende Monatschrift* and takes in the *Bookman*, and replaces the philological hand apparatus on his revolving book-shelf by a set of the British poets and the *Library of the World's Best Literature*.

It may be said that the outcome of an American course of graduate study is often equally futile and deplorable. It must be admitted that the machine-made doctor of philosophy often remains essentially a barbarian, unread outside of the technical literature of his specialty, unfurnished with those general ideas the possession of which was Taine's criterion of the educated man, and incapable of either writing or understanding English of the sound tradition. From this text our impatient critics proceed to a general onslaught on American scholarship and denunciation of the Germanized American university, its minutely specialized courses, its seminars, and the doctoral dissertations, the parody of whose titles is a gag that never fails with a popular audience. They would reform it altogether, and substitute for the idea of training investigators the endeavor to produce teachers, writers, intellectual leaders, of broad and liberal culture. With the demand for the humanization of our scholarship I heartily sympathize, though I would accompany it by a plea for the fortifying of our culture by a little more respect for exact knowledge. It is not the excess of either erudition or culture, but their assumed incompatibility and divorce, from which our higher education is suffering. But in their eagerness for the end, our literary censors investigate the disease superficially and prescribe impossible remedies. They ignore the complexity of the problem and do scant justice to the efforts of university instructors to solve it. They forget that in the graduate school, at any rate, culture really

is and must be a by-product. A three years' graduate curriculum, devoted ostensibly and mainly to cultural courses, wide reading in general literature, and daily or monthly themes, is an impossible piece of educational machinery. The more serious students would revolt at its aimlessness, and the public would very properly want to know what the undergraduate course was for.

III.

And this brings us to the central difficulty with which the American university professor is struggling, not quite so unconsciously, or, if we take long views, so hopelessly as the genial onlooker assumes. The deficiency of the ordinary graduate student not only in respect of culture, but in the elementary technique of his specialty, is due to the comparative failure of collegiate education, that in turn to the lax training of the secondary schools, and that again to the low intellectual standards of a young, prosperous, commercialized nation, and the reaction of the indulgent American parent against what he deems puritanic or old-world ideas of discipline and restraint. This fatal sequence and the recriminations to which it gives rise are an old story which it is useless to repeat here. It may be freely conceded that the university, too, contributes its share of errors to our pedagogical muddle. But if these could be eliminated by the wisdom of its critics, the chief problem would still remain: the retrieval in three short years of the losses and waste of ten years of confused and misdirected effort. It cannot be done without sacrifice. So long as the American graduate student enters the university unable to write lucid English and ungrounded in the elements of the subject which he proposes to pursue, he must work a little longer and a little harder for his degree than he normally should. Even so, he will not achieve a perfect adjustment of the ideals of professional competency and breadth of culture. In the nature of things he will incline to one side with some sacrifice of the other. The scheme of the graduate curriculum is broad enough to include both. It is already so administered in many places as to do justice to the reasonable claims of both. The name seminar need frighten nobody, so long as it is recognized that a seminar may deal with the literary criticism of the Greek drama or the philosophy of Plato as well as with the text criticism of Pliny's letters or the syntax of the Greek verb. The acceptance of an occasional doctoral dissertation on a Greek particle or the manuscripts of Catullus should be no grievance to the student of broader interests, provided he himself is encouraged and helped to write, if he can, a readable monograph on some literary, historical, or philosophic theme. The graduate school can meet all the legitimate needs of more aspiring spirits without sacrificing its present ideal of exact, first-hand

scholarship within a definite field for all and original research for some. It is not and should not be any considerable part of its function to provide either "inspiration" in the form of eloquent popular lectures or training courses for the journalist, the novelist, and the essayist. These things, so far as they can be taught at all, belong either in the second half of the collegiate course or in the extension department. The "mere" *littérateur* should not attempt to force his point of view upon the graduate school. But if he can afford the time he will greatly profit by accepting its point of view provisionally and for one or two years. From the narrowest curriculum he will acquire something which in America he could hardly get in any other way, the scholar's conscience and a clear conception of the difference between first-hand and second-hand knowledge.

These preliminary reserves and qualifications threaten to occupy more space than the main thesis. But *distinguo* is the first word of my philosophy as of Montaigne's. The indiscriminating attribution to German influence of all real and imaginary defects of the American graduate school and the systematic exaggeration of the supposed antithesis between scholarship and culture can do no possible good. Nietzsche's eloquent diatribes against the excesses of history and philology have no application to our conditions. The superior culture of Oxford or Paris is not due to the substitution of culture courses for detailed and precise work. It is due to the background of the national tradition in language and literature, and the controlling consciousness of this tradition in the minds of teachers and taught. Germany has never had such a tradition and our dependence on Germany has prevented us from renewing ours, interrupted by the conditions of colonial and pioneer life.

The mere habituation of American scholars to German prose, through their most impressionable years, would keep them from attaining the certainty of linguistic instinct of a cultivated Englishman or Frenchman. *La prose allemande n'existe pas*, says a distinguished French critic. Unfortunately, it does exist for American philologists as an *exemplar vitiis imitabile*. I refer not merely to the omnibus type of German sentence wittily described by De Quincy, Ruskin, and Mark Twain, to the "something splay" in the German language which Nietzsche quotes from Matthew Arnold, or to the all pervading mixed metaphor. Rhetoric is something larger than refinements of style or diction; it is psychology, tact, taste. Professor von Wilamowitz is not only one of the greatest of living scholars, but in his way a man of the broadest and finest culture. But all his genius could not save Goethe from the cabbage passage in Werther, and all his Hellenism could not guard Wilamowitz

against that sophomoric flight of rhetoric about the Athenian sewers at the close of his *Aus Kydathen*, which would be as impossible to a Jebb or a Gaston Boissier as we trust it will some day seem to American scholars of equal standing.

Style is only a symptom of deeper things. A Germanized education makes our scholars strangers to their own national literature, and confuses all their literary, historical, and cultural perspectives. It may be doubted whether literary criticism can ever rise higher than its source in the critic's immediate perception of values in the language and literature to which he is born. From this must come the analogies, instincts, standards, that control and keep sane the philological criticism of other literatures. The criticism of German scholars lacks and always has lacked this balance-wheel. They do not know their own literature as Frenchmen and Englishmen know theirs, nor do they write with constant reference to it. And if they did it could supply them no equivalent of the poetry of England, the drama and the prose of France. The consequent crudity and amateurishness of their criticism of life and letters is their misfortune and not their fault. But it will surely be our fault if, dazzled by the prestige of their learning, we continue much longer to take seriously their Homeric theories, their interpretations of the Platonic philosophy, their estimates of Cicero and Vergil; if we accept as contributions to comparative literature articles on *Der Einfluss der Anakreontik auf Johann Peter Uz*, or the triple sawdust of Stemplinger's *fortleben der Horazischen Lyrik*¹, and Billeter's *Die Anschauungen vom Wesen des Griechenthums*; if we study Mill's Platonism only at second hand in Gomperz, and treat the Homeric views of Andrew Lang respectfully only when they come back to us in Rothe; if we waste our students' attention on Robert's *tours de passe-passe* with Mycenaean and Ionian armor, or on Mülders equations of eyes and oysters; if we assist the disciples of Blass in rearing the baby science of prose rhythm, conceived in the innocence of a scholar whose naïve surprise at the cadences of Plato and Demosthenes was untempered by any previous experience of De Quincy or Ruskin; if we accept the estimates of reviewers blind to the crushing superiority of Jebb's Sophocles, Gaston Boissier's Cicero, or Croiset's history of Greek literature, and acquiesce in the judgment that dismisses Pater's Plato and Platonism as the trifling of an amateur, while treating the pseudo-science of Lutoslawski as an advancement of knowledge; if we remain to the end dependent on bibliographies that catalogue Jane Austen's *Sense and Sensibility* under *Sinneswahrnehmung* and list a reprint of Fitzgerald's Agamemnon as a new text edition.

¹ See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2.67-68.

Something too much of these obvious and ungracious reflections. It is, I repeat, not the fault of the Germans that the false historical perspective and *Umwerthung aller Werthe* which accompany their gifts of learning are a hindrance and not a help to the heirs of Chaucer and Tennyson. The remedy, as we have seen, is not to substitute culture courses for scholarship, but to train our scholars at home as French and English scholars are trained in an environment and by methods that shall subject the form and relate the content of their knowledge to the high tradition of their own language, literature, and inherited culture. This cannot be done in a day or a generation. For it will take a generation to prepare the teachers. But we may make a beginning now—with ourselves, as well as with our pupils.

IV.

Thus far I have spoken of our own special problem of the adjustment of an imported professional scholarship to our national education and culture. But there is a brief final word to be said on the need of rescuing scholarship itself from the German yoke. The public will suppose me to mean from German pedantry and superfluous accuracy in insignificant research—but I mean in all seriousness from German inaccuracy. The disease of German scholarship, well indicated by Matthew Arnold in *God and the Bible*, has now infected all the world. The game of investigation, as played by its most brilliant practitioners, threatens to become a systematic dissemination of error and perversion of the feeling for evidence. In a large proportion of philological and historical problems, the most that we can hope to attain is an accurate collection of the insufficient evidence and a clean-cut statement of the alternative probabilities. There still remains an enormous amount of this work to be done. Instead of doing it, the Germanized scholarship of the world insists on "sweatboxing" the evidence and straining after "vigorous and rigorous" demonstration of things that do not admit of proof. The method is openly avowed and defended on principle. The scholar who lacks the courage to make mistakes, they say, will make no discoveries. They quote Bacon to the effect that truth emerges more readily from error than from confusion, and take this to mean that the systematic elaboration of absurdity is the true philological method. The practical results are deplorable. The chief objection to hunting for mares' nests is that you are sure to find them. But the quest itself impairs the reasoning powers. It obscures in our teaching and in the eyes of the public the true cultural aims of philological study by an excess not of precision, which can never do harm, but of that parody of scientific research which consists in the "pyramiding" of unverifiable hypotheses. It blinds us to the elementary logical truth that the resultant probability of

such a process is not the summation but the fractional product of the probabilities of the separate steps. And what is more, the predetermined resolve to achieve results vitiates the separate steps. The public even of scholars has no conception of the quantity of misstatement now circulating in accredited books signed by reputable names; and it is impossible to tell them because the enumeration of errors is not only invidious in a writer, but intolerably wearisome to the reader. There are large fields of philology in which we shall be compelled to do the work all over again, in order to determine the simple facts of the tradition uncolored by the pleas of advocates with points to prove. The big ambitious books of the Nordens, the Heinzes, the Reitzensteins, the Joels, the Dümmlers, the Hirzels, the Wendlands, and even, alas! of the Wilamowitzes cannot be trusted. They cannot be safely used without laborious verification, and verification too often reveals that the texts cited are mistranslated, misinterpreted, or, at any rate, do not prove the point. American scholars have not wholly escaped this infection. But either some defect of ambition or a remnant of Yankee common sense makes the majority of them immune to the disease in its most virulent form. There are compensations in all things. It is sad that our scholarship, as our literary friends so often remind us, is hard, thin, dry, matter-of-fact, syntactical, statistical, archaeological, and negative; that it never rises to the comprehensive survey and the generous *élan* of constructive hypothesis of Germany, and is lacking in the grace and charm of France, the restrained emotion and finished eloquence of England. But I console myself with the reflection that perhaps, while we are growing to our full stature, it is the temporary mission of our hardness and thinness to correct some of the excesses associated with the admirable qualities that are beyond our reach. We are often reproached for not producing those charming, readable essays that flow so frequently from the facile pens of our French and English colleagues. Well, Professor Butcher's lecture on Greek literary criticism is pleasant reading, but I am not certain that the multiplication of such lectures would be a more desirable outcome of our scholarship than are Professor Carroll's dissertation on Aristotle's *Poetics*, Dr. Baker's study of literary criticism in Greek comedy, or Professor Van Hook's dissertation on the terminology of Greek literary criticism. I open Professor Butcher's essays at random and read:

Plato goes so far as to discover a moral danger in prose compositions which lack rhythm or harmony: to his mind they indicate some disorder within the soul.

Here is a testimony of rhythmical prose indeed. It is most interesting. Unfortunately, Plato says nothing remotely resembling what is here attributed to

him. The passage of the Laws cited in support of the statement is completely misunderstood. I open Professor Mackail's¹ delightful lectures on Greek poetry and find an eloquent page about an awesome lightning flash which illuminates an awful pause before the retreat of the Trojans. Nothing could be more impressive—if true. But there is no lightning flash, and the simile does not illuminate the terror-stricken pause of the Trojans, but the breathing space won by the Greeks seventeen lines after the pause. If we must choose, I prefer American thinness and dryness to this. We may pay too high a price not only for a German *geistreiche Combination*, but for French neatness of antithesis and English romantic sentiment. To adapt the phrases of Emerson, let us sit at home with might and make the best of ourselves.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

PAUL SHOREY.

REVIEW

The Lay Of Dolon. The Tenth Book of Homer's Iliad. Some notes on its language, verse, and contents. With Remarks by the way on the Canons and Methods of Homeric Criticism. By Alexander Shewan. London: Macmillan and Co. (1911). Pp. xl + 290. \$3.25.

After an Introduction of 27 pages, in which the author expresses his satisfaction that the battle is turning against the Dissectors of Homer, a "Provisional" Bibliography is given. This contains the names of about 140 writers and over 200 titles. One is skeptical of such lists, since often there is nothing in the book to show the author has read much there mentioned. In this Bibliography three works written by three Americans are named, while in the book itself fifteen works by eleven Americans are quoted, and so quoted as to show complete mastery of each of these fifteen works. This ratio of five works quoted to each one named in the Bibliography is, I judge, about the average ratio, so that hardly less than 1000 separate books or documents are used, in addition to lexica, indices, and grammars.

Not only does Mr. Shewan give the drift of a book in a few apt sentences, but he has at his command the various reviews thereof. Thus, e. g., he gives the argument advanced by Geddes with his own judgment of its value, also the opinion of Father Browne, and on p. 131 a summary and appreciation of the brilliant review by Professor Packard which was published in the first number of the American Journal of Philology. This thoroughness is not exceptional but the rule. The mastery shown of Homeric literature, even the most remote and inaccessible, is astounding and, to me, most discouraging.

¹ See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 4.93-95.

The language, verse, vocabulary, use of digamma, and repeated verses are all put to the severest test and they agree in placing the Doloneia with the other books of the Iliad. Linguistic tests as well as absence of interpolation show that it is one of the books most free from contamination; cf. p. 59: "It may almost be said that not one exceptional construction has been established, and the few forms that are special to the Book can be explained without difficulty".

How weak some standard arguments are is shown by this striking example. It is well known that *ισεδαστοια* is found only in K 462 and in the Odyssey, apparently a strong argument for Odyssean affinity, but, as Mr. Shewan remarks, "In the Iliad there is no occurrence outside of K of the dative plural of this word in any gender; so no inference can be drawn".

The theories based on the use of the article are now exploded, as the assumed difference between the Iliad and Odyssey in this regard has been shown to be a delusion, but Mr. Shewan adds a most effective argument by showing that certain large sections of Paradise Lost differ widely from each other in the use of the article; hence no conclusions could be fairly drawn, even if the supposed divergence in Homer were a fact.

Every difference between the Iliad and the Odyssey recedes as one draws near. Take an example. Monroe, Odyssey 333, wrote: "Neglect of position is perceptibly commoner in the Iliad than in the Odyssey". Mr. Shewan has investigated this with great care and finds that there are 29 cases of inexcusable neglect of position in the Iliad, and but 20 in the Odyssey, the reverse of Monroe's assumption.

Gemoll in his treatise on Repetitions argued that Kappa was later than the Odyssey "since the poet of this book imitated the great scenes of the Odyssey, and of the Odyssey only". Mr. Shewan asks, "Why did he not imitate the Iliad? Were Kappa and the Odyssey written before the Iliad?" He then shows hidden resemblances binding Kappa with the Iliad, not those of imitation, but of a common original author.

A frequent criticism on verse 157, where Nestor wakens Diomedes "by shoving him with the foot", is that it is an unheroic method; Gemoll asks "Why could Nestor not waken Diomedes with the spear?" Mr. Shewan replies "The spear was sharp at both ends and not suitable for so delicate an operation". So simple, and so sensible.

The sum of the author's arguments is this: K agrees in every essential detail with the rest of the Iliad, yet differs enough in setting, action, description, and language to show that it is no mere imitation, but a creation of the same genius who composed the other books.

In the Introduction he modestly says: "The contents of the book are mostly spade-work of a humble description". Yet, good as every part of the book is, by all odds the best things in it are the author's own. It is hard to single out any one portion for especial praise, but the arguments adduced to show that *K* is an integral part of the *Iliad* and that it is referred to in later books seem to me superb (see pp. 144 ff.). These arguments are not of the sort one gets by studying lexica and indices, but come only from an intimate knowledge and appreciation of the poems. The modesty and reserve with which all opinions are expressed win the confidence of the reader.

The *Doloneia* has long been an outcast. But Muelder, Rothe, and Lang have recently defended its rights to membership in the family of the *Iliad*, and the case has been immeasurably strengthened by Mr. Shewan, whose facts, logic, and conclusions seem to me final and unanswerable. Homeric critics will not answer them, few will try; they will simply "go round" and ignore them.

This book places its author in the very front rank of Homeric scholars.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

JOHN A. SCOTT.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF PITTSBURGH AND VICINITY

The sixth and final meeting of the fourth year of The Classical Association of Pittsburgh and Vicinity was held conjointly with a meeting of the local Archaeological society at Washington and Jefferson College, Saturday, April 29.

The guest of honor was Professor Charles E. Bennett, of Cornell University. Following the address of welcome by President James D. Moffat, Professor Bennett delivered an address on Perspective in Classical Study and Teaching. This was one of the strongest and clearest papers ever read before the association. His timely criticism of the dangerous and mischief working views of Edmiston, Showerman, and Babbitt was received enthusiastically by a large and appreciative audience. The noble work and the valiant enterprise of the graduate schools of this country and of other countries was clearly demonstrated. The carping criticism of those who see in a doctor's thesis only a weary wandering in meandering mazes through the realms of intellectual uncertainty was shown to be entirely out of perspective.

At two thirty Professor H. E. Wells, of Washington and Jefferson College, accompanied by Mrs. Wells, rendered several selections of ancient Greek music, which were heard with much interest and were received with great enthusiasm. Following this, Professor H. F. Allen, also of Washington

and Jefferson, gave in his usual clear and forceful style an illustrated paper on the Olympic games.

The following officers for next year were elected: President, Professor B. L. Ullman, University of Pittsburgh; Vice President, Miss Wilma Schmitz, Pittsburgh High School; Secretary-Treasurer, Professor William Douglas, Shadyside Academy.

ROBERT B. ENGLISH, President.

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE.

AD FERIATURUM¹

I, puer, abiciens libros paulisper inanes,
 neu pede praecipiti cymbala terna mane.
 Iam resonis volves mellitum gummi labellis,
 castaneasque nuces dente crepante teres.
 Undique fatalem menthae spirabis odorem,
 et iacies uda chartea tela manu.
 Nec capies caeca versutos arte magistros,
 nec repetes tristis, sole cadente, lares.
 I, puer, invigilans aurigae dona ferenti,
 ne tibi promerito sarcina flagra gerat.
 Pollicibus retegant instructis pruna placentae,
 dum glomerata domus teque scholamque probet.
 Necte choros: rapias, visco pendente, puellas:
 oscula si fugient, at cito plura dabunt.
 Mox equa suscipiet timidos nocturna labores.
 Cras removebit onus, vae! medicina tuum.
 Tunc ego mulcebo caput, et bene nota monebo:
 pectore sollicito tu nova sponsa gemes.
 I, puer, atque redi: "Iucundus, acerbus es idem:
 nec tecum possum vivere, nec sine te".

EPIGRAMMATA

AD CLARISSIMAN MAGISTRAM, L. MINOR

Quamquam nomine tu MINOR vocaris,
 geometra tamen gigas habetis!

AD CLARISSIMAN MAGISTRAM, F. COLTER

CULTER nomine tu quidem vocaris,
 trux heu! materies, acuta, dira,
 stillans sanguine, matribus feroxque,
 at non indole tu tua nec usu
 sed sane placidissima et benigna!

JOHN E. KENNY.

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, St. Paul, Minnesota.

To subscribers who wish to make their files of Volume 4 complete we shall send copies of the various numbers, so long as our supply lasts, on receipt of a one cent stamp for each copy desired. Address Professor Knapp.

¹ These verses were written by Dr. Caskie Harrison, widely known for many years as a successful teacher of Latin and as principal of an important school in Brooklyn.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College, 525 West 120th Street, New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY**), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

NEW IN PLAN—NEW IN METHOD

CAESAR'S FIRST CAMPAIGN

A Beginner's Latin Book

By WILLIAM A. JENNER and HENRY E. WILSON of the Boys' High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Illustrated 12mo, Cloth, \$1.00

A first-year book, peerless as an introduction to Caesar.

The scientifically selected vocabulary is limited exclusively to Caesarean words.

D. APPLETON AND COMPANY

New York

Chicago

READY THIS SUMMER

Baras's Third Year Latin for Sight Reading

Edited by J. EDMUND BARSS, the Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn.

Janes's Second Year Latin for Sight Reading

Edited by A. L. JANES, Boys' High School, Brooklyn.

Nutting's Latin Primer

By H. C. NUTTING, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Latin, University of Chicago.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

100 Washington Square

::

NEW YORK CITY

HIGH SCHOOL COURSE IN LATIN COMPOSITION

By CHARLES MCCOY BAKER, Horace Mann School, Teachers' College, and ALEXANDER JAMES INGLIS, Horace Mann School, Teachers' College, 12 mo. Cloth. xiii+463 pages. \$1.00 net.

This book consists of three parts arranged for practice in writing Latin during the last three years of school, and, in addition, a summary of the Elements of Syntax for reference.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

BOSTON CHICAGO DALLAS SAN FRANCISCO

REVISED EDITION

BARSS' WRITING LATIN

Based on Lodge's "Vocabulary of High School Latin."

"A pronounced advance beyond the first edition, and will prove useful in many schools."—D. O. S. Lowell, *Headmaster Roxbury Latin School*. Cloth 144 Pages. 50 cents.

D. C. HEATH & CO., Publishers

231-241 West 39th St.,

New York

The New York State Regents Requirements For Sight Reading

are now included in the separate class texts which have always been supplied FREE with the LAKE LATIN SERIES.

Consider them before purchasing this material at EXTRA COST.

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

623 South Wabash Ave., Chicago

37 East 28th St., New York

Just Published

D'Ooge's Latin for Beginners

By BENJAMIN L. D'OOGHE, Professor of Latin in Michigan State Normal College.

Latin for Beginners, written by an experienced teacher and leading author of Latin textbooks, presents the elements of Latin to younger pupils. The methods are modern, the treatment is full, and the material used is placed thoroughly within the grasp of immature minds.

The book contains four particularly beautiful colored illustrations from the life of the ancient Romans.

GINN AND COMPANY

70 Fifth Avenue

New York

Columbia University Summer Session

JULY 5—AUGUST 16, 1911

Greek—Elementary Course. At 10:30.

Associate Professor Macurdy.

Greek Drama: Euripides—Professor Macurdy. At 11:30.

Xenophon, *Anabasis* I-VII—Professor Knapp. At 10:30.

Latin—Elementary Course—Miss Wye. At 11:30.

Prose Composition: Secondary School Course. Miss Wye. At 9:30.

Horace, Odes and Epodes, Catullus (Selections). Professor F. G. Moore. At 1:30.

Prose Composition. Professor McCrea. At 9:30.

Tacitus, Selections from the Histories. Professor Moore. At 2:30.

Vergil's *Aeneid* I-VI. Professor McCrea. At 10:30.

Research Course in Roman Satire. Professor Knapp. At 9:30.

